

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments is respectfully requested prior to the next action.

In the last Office Action, the Examiner suggested that the prior claims might not specifically indicate that the process of using the phone number to locate a service always occurs in the mobile station.

Applicants cannot agree that the claims as previously presented did not specify that the second and third step occurred in the mobile station. Claim 1, for example, has a preamble that requires all of the following steps to be carried out in the mobile station, not just the “receiving” step and the “sending” step. The claims as previously presented also required sending a request message from the mobile station to base station equipment, with the request message including a service code.

Nonetheless, Applicants have now specifically and carefully amended all of the independent claims to make it absolutely clear that the service code is determined by the mobile station accessing a cause table.

For example, in Claim 1 as now amended, recites:

using the phone number, at the mobile station, to locate a service code in a cause table that maps phone numbers to service codes wherein the service code identifies the private service;
coding a service type field, at the mobile station, into a request message to indicate the private service identified by the located service code; and

Claim 13 has been similarly amended. Whether it did previously or not, it now definitely specifies that the claim is directed to a mobile station (MS) operating in a private network, and that the table which stores the map of the phone numbers to the service codes is stored in the mobile station. Claim 13 also requires the message coder that uses the phone number to locate a service code to also be located in the mobile station.

Claim 25 is now specifically directed to a computer program product, which must be located in a mobile station (MS), and which receives a request at the MS to originate a call which specifies a phone number, and then uses that phone number at the MS to locate a service code in a cause table that is stored at the MS.

Likewise, Claim 37 is now specifically directed to a mobile station apparatus that comprises means for using the phone number at the mobile station to locate a service code in a cause table stored at the mobile station, and means for coding a service type field also located at the mobile station.

The other independent Claims 49, 55, 61 and 67 are directed to methods and/or apparatus that are not necessarily located at the mobile station. However, these methods and apparatus require receiving a message from a mobile station that already specifies a service code. For example, Claim 49 as now amended, explicitly states the step of granting resources to service a call depending upon a cause code as specified in a request message received from a mobile station as well as using the service type code as received from the mobile station.

Similar amendments have been made to Claims 55, 61 and 67.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

David J. Thibodeau, Jr.
Registration No. 31,671
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Date: 9/19/07